

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3 and 5-7 are presented for consideration, with Claims 1 and 7 being independent.

Claims 1 and 7 have been amended to further distinguish Applicants' invention from the cited art.

The amendments to the claims were not presented earlier as it was believed that the previously presented claims would be found allowable. This Amendment does not add any additional claims. Moreover, the Examiner's familiarity with the subject matter of the present application will allow an appreciation of the significance of the amendments herein without undue expenditure of time and effort. Finally, the Amendment does not raise new issues requiring further consideration or search. Accordingly, it is submitted that entry of the Amendment is appropriate.

Claims 1, 3 and 5-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being obvious over More '852 in view of Furukawa '301.¹ This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 of Applicants' invention relates to a driving method of a display apparatus, and includes a first drawing step of displaying an image on a display apparatus having a memory characteristic on the basis of an image signal from first image creation means, and a second step of overwriting a handwritten image on the displayed image on the basis of a signal from a second

¹ Chang '707 is identified as the secondary citation in paragraph 2 of the Office Action, but the body of the rejection discusses Furukawa.

image creation means in which the handwritten image is stored. In the first drawing step, an image is drawn by a reset drive for resetting a previous display image and a writing drive for writing an image. In the second drawing step, the writing drive of a substantially minimum or a substantially maximum luminance is performed without effecting the reset drive in an area in which the handwritten image is written, while the same writing drive as performed in the first drawing step is performed in areas in which the handwritten image is not written.

Independent Claim 7 relates to a driving method of a display apparatus and includes first and second drawing steps as set forth in Claim 1. In the first drawing step, an image is drawn by a reset drive for resetting a previous display image and a writing drive for writing an image, and in the second drawing step the writing drive of a minimum or a maximum luminance is performed without effecting the reset drive only in an area in which the handwritten image is written, while no voltage is applied to areas in which the handwritten image is not written.

As discussed in the previous Amendment of April 27, 2009, the primary citation to More relates to a display device that is responsive to hand printed text and hand drawn graphics. With reference to Figure 9A, the Office Action asserts that More discloses a first drawing step of displaying an image on a display panel. The Office Action acknowledges that More does not teach a second drawing step as set forth in Claims 1 and 7.

The secondary citation to Furukawa relates to a handwritten character input device. The Office Action relies on Figures 4(a) through 4(d) for a teaching of overwriting a handwritten image. In this regard, it is respectfully submitted that Furukawa, while allowing for handwritten

input, does not teach or suggest a second drawing step while the same writing drive as performed in the first drawing step is performed in areas in which the handwritten image is not written (as in Claim 1) or while no voltage is applied to areas in which the handwritten image is not written (as in Claim 7). In Furukawa, electronic pen 401 is used to transfer information to a handwritten character input terminal 404. As shown in Figures 4(a) through 4(d), however, modification processes such as a) deletion, b) addition, c) replacement, and d) emphasis of an entered content, are provided, but not as the image displayed in the first drawing step is maintained. In accordance with Applicants' claimed invention, on the other hand, the image displayed in the first drawing step is maintained as the second drawing step is performed. This is shown, for example, in Figure 1 (display image h) and discussed on page 15, line 27 through page 25, line 24 of the specification.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the proposed combination of More and Furukawa, even if proper, still fails to teach or suggest Applicants' invention as set forth in Claims 1 and 7.

Thus, it is submitted that Applicants' invention as set forth in independent Claims 1 and 7 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent Claims 3, 5 and 6 set forth additional features of Applicants' invention. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of this application is deemed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Malpede/

Scott D. Malpede
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 32,533

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

SDM/vmm

FCHS_WS 3892319v1